Achievability Proof via Output Statistics of Random Binning

Mohammad Hossein Yassaee, Mohammad Reza Aref, Amin Gohari
Information Systems and Security Lab (ISSL),
Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran,
E-mail: yassaee@ee.sharif.edu, {aref,aminzadeh}@sharif.edu.

arXiv:1203.0730v1 [cs.IT] 4 Mar 2012

Abstract

This paper presents a new and ubiquitous framework for establishing achievability results in *network information theory* (NIT) problems. The framework is used to prove various new results. To express the main tool, consider a set of discrete memoryless correlated sources (DMCS). Assume that each source (except one, Z^n) is randomly binned at a finite rate. We find sufficient conditions on these rates such that the bin indices are nearly mutually independent of each other and of Z^n. This is used in conjunction with the Slepian-Wolf (S-W) result to set up the framework. We begin by illustrating this method via examples from channel coding and rate-distortion (or covering problems). Next, we use the framework to prove a new result on the lossy transmission of a source over a broadcast channel. We also prove a new lower bound to a three receiver wiretap broadcast channel under a strong secrecy criterion. We observe that we can directly prove the strong notion of secrecy without resorting to the common techniques, e.g., the leftover hash lemma. We have also used our technique to solve the problem of two-node interactive channel simulation and the problem of coordination via a relay.

I. INTRODUCTION

Random coding and random binning are widely used in the achievability proofs of the network information theory (NIT) problems. Random coding is a channel coding technique that allows one to prove the existence of a good codebook (which is a subset of the product set $\mathcal{X}^n_{[1:T]} := \prod_{i=1}^{T} \mathcal{X}^n_i$), while random binning is a source coding technique that partitions the product set into bins with desired properties.

Existing achievability proofs for source coding and channel coding problems are mostly based on repeated use of these techniques. Moreover some connections between certain source coding and channel coding problems has been observed. Slepian and Wolf, in their seminal paper on the lossless source coding [2], interpreted the achievability of the rate $R = H(X|Y)$ for compressing the source X^n at rate R to a destination with access to the source Y^n, through a channel coding problem. In contrast, Csiszar and Korner, obtained an achievability proof for multiple access channels (MAC) through the distributed source coding problem of Slepian and Wolf [3]. In a recent work [4], Renes and Renner showed the achievability of the channel capacity via a combination of Slepian-Wolf (S-W) coding and privacy amplification. The main theme in these works is that the set of sequences mapped to the same index through S-W coding constitutes a good channel code, and hence we have a decomposition of the product set into the channel codebooks. Similarly our framework treats source coding and channel coding problems on the same footing.

Consider the problem of sending a message M over the channel $q(y|x)$. Traditional random coding considers an encoder $X^n(M, F)$ and a decoder $\hat{M}(Y^n, F)$ where F is a common randomness, independent of M, available to both the transmitter and receiver. R.v. F represents the random nature of codebook generation. Since the probability of error is the average of that over all realizations of F, one can find f such that $X^n(M, F = f)$ and $\hat{M}(Y^n, F = f)$ form appropriate encoder and decoder. We depart from this by first generating n i.i.d. copies of X^n and Y^n. Then we take both F and M to be functions of X^n such that F is nearly independent of M. Note that we still have the property that $p(y^n|x^n, F = f) = p(y^n|x^n)$ and $p(m|F = f) \approx p(m)$ meaning that $X^n(M, F = f)$ and $\hat{M}(Y^n, F = f)$ are legitimate choices as *stochastic* encoder and decoder. We construct F and M as random partitions (bindings) of X^n. The question then arises that under what conditions two random bin indices are independent (as in the case of F and M), and what is the sufficient condition for recovering X^n from Y^n and a bin index F.

To answer these questions in a more general framework, in Section II, we prove two main theorems on approximating the joint pmf of the bin indices in a distributed random binning. We study properties of random binning in two extreme regimes, namely, when the binning rates are low and high. In the first case, we observe that if the rates of a distributed random binning are sufficiently small, the bin indices are nearly jointly independent, uniformly distributed and independent of a non-binned source Z^n. This result generalizes the one for the channel intrinsic randomness [10]. The second case is the S-W region, which shows that if the rates of distributed binning are sufficiently large, the outputs of random binning are enough to recover the sources.

We argue that not only the new framework has a simple structure (it uses *only* random binning), but it can solve some problems much easier than the traditional techniques; see [18], [19] for two examples. These examples consider the problems of channel simulation and coordination. In [18] we find an exact computable characterization of a multi-round channel simulation problem for which only inner and outer bounds were known previously. In coordination problems we want to generate random variables whose joint distribution is close to the desired i.i.d. distribution in total variation distance. Traditional techniques (such as packing and covering lemmas) commonly address the probability of error events. This is not general enough to cover all of the total variation distance constraints that show up in the coordination problems. In such cases one has to come up with new proof techniques. One particular case is the resolvability lemma used by Cuff (see [13, Lemma 19]).

Furthermore, we believe that the framework leads to more rigorous and simpler proofs for problems in secrecy. In problems of secrecy one has to deal with certain equivocation rates. Generally speaking there are two general techniques for proving lower bounds on equivocation rates: one is to prove existence of “good” codebooks with given properties. These good codebooks are then used to compute the equivocation rates. This approach was originally used by Csiszar and Korner in [5]. The second approach is to compute the expected value of equivocation rates over codebooks, and prove existence of a “good” codebook with large equivocation rate (in the same way that a codebook with small probability of error is identified). Some existing works on secrecy follow the second approach in a non-rigorous way. Instead of defining a random variable for the random codebook and conditioning the equivocation rates by that random codebook, they use the unconditioned distribution to calculate the equivocation rates. The recent book by El Gamal and Kim [1] uses the second approach in a rigorous way. However in some scenarios calculation of equivocation rates conditioned on the codebook r.v. can be involved. We believe that our framework leads to simpler proofs in such cases.

Moreover we can prove strong secrecy results for multi terminal scenarios. One way to prove strong secrecy results is to use privacy amplification of Maurer and Wolf [6]. Another approach is to use resolvability techniques [7], [8]. To best of our knowledge resolvability techniques are not developed for multi terminal scenarios except for one work on MACs [11]. The latter result has been used in [9] to prove strong secrecy results for two-way channels. Our approach resembles the resolvability techniques, and is able to deal with strong secrecy in general multi terminal scenarios.

This paper is organized as follows: in Section III we begin by demonstrating our approach for some primitive problems of NIT, i.e. channel coding and lossy source coding problems, before getting into our new results. Then we apply our approach to two complicated scenarios, i.e., lossy coding over broadcast channels and a three receiver wiretap broadcast channel under a strong secrecy constraint. In Section IV, we discuss connections between our framework and the covering and packing lemmas in a multivariate setup. We show that the set of typical sequences can be decomposed into covering and packing codebooks. Finally in Section V, we give a summary of our framework.

Notation: In this paper, we use $X_{\mathcal{S}}$ to denote $(X_j : j \in \mathcal{S})$, $p^U_{\mathcal{A}}$ to denote the uniform distribution over the set $\mathcal{A}$ and $p(x^n)$ to denote the the i.i.d. pmf $\prod_{i=1}^n p(x_i)$, unless otherwise stated. The total variation between two pmf's p and q on the same alphabet $\mathcal{X}$, is defined by $\|p(x) - q(x)\|_1 := \frac{1}{2}\sum_x |p(x) - q(x)|$.

Remark 1 *Similar to [13] in this work we frequently use the concept of* random *pmfs, which we denote by capital letters (e.g. P_X). For any countable set $\mathcal{X}$ let $\Delta^{\mathcal{X}}$ be the probability simplex for distributions on $\mathcal{X}$. A random pmf P_X is a probability distribution over $\Delta^{\mathcal{X}}$. In other words, if we use Ω to denote the sample space, the mapping $\omega \in \Omega \mapsto P_X(x;\omega)$ is a random variable for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $P_X(x;\omega) \geq 0$ and $\sum_x P_X(x;\omega) = 1$ for all ω. Thus, $\omega \mapsto P_X(\cdot;\omega)$ is a vector of random variables, which we denote by P_X. We can definite $P_{X,Y}$ on product set $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ in a similar way. We note that we can continue to use the law of total probability with random pmfs (e.g. to write $P_X(x) = \sum_y P_{XY}(x,y)$ meaning that $P_X(x;\omega) = \sum_y P_{XY}(x,y;\omega)$ for all ω) and the conditional probability pmfs (e.g. to write $P_{Y|X}(y|x) = \frac{P_{XY}(x,y)}{P_X(x)}$ meaning that $P_{Y|X}(y|x;\omega) = \frac{P_{XY}(x,y;\omega)}{P_X(x;\omega)}$ for all ω).*

II. OUTPUT STATISTICS OF RANDOM BINNING

Let $(X_{[1:T]}, Z)$ be a DMCS distributed according to a joint pmf $p_{X_{[1:T]},Z}$ on a countably infinite set $\prod_{i=1}^T \mathcal{X}_i \times \mathcal{Z}$. A distributed random binning consists of a set of random mappings $\mathcal{B}_i : \mathcal{X}_i^n \to [1 : 2^{nR_i}]$, $i \in [1 : T]$, in which $\mathcal{B}_i$ maps each sequence of $\mathcal{X}_i^n$ uniformly and independently to the set $[1 : 2^{nR_i}]$. We denote the random variable $\mathcal{B}_t(X_t^n)$

by B_t. A random distributed binning induces the following *random pmf* on the set $\mathcal{X}_{[1:T]}^n \times \mathcal{Z}^n \times \prod_{t=1}^T [1 : 2^{nR_t}]$,[1]

$$P(x_{[1:T]}^n, z^n, b_{[1:T]}) = p(x_{[1:T]}^n, z^n) \prod_{t=1}^T \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}_t(x_t^n) = b_t\}.$$

One can easily verify that $(B_1, \cdots, B_T)$ are uniformly distributed and mutually independent of Z^n in the mean, that is

$$\mathbb{E}P(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) = 2^{-n\sum_{t=1}^T R_t} p(z^n) = p(z^n) \prod_{t=1}^T p_{[1:2^{nR_t}]}^U(b_t).$$

The following theorem finds constraints on the rate-tuple $(R_1, \cdots, R_T)$, such that the preceding observation about the mean holds for almost any distributed binning. We will be using this theorem frequently in the proofs. A more general form of this theorem is provided and proved in the appendix.

Theorem 1 *If for each $\mathcal{S} \subseteq [1 : T]$, the following constraint holds*

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}} R_t < H(X_{\mathcal{S}}|Z), \tag{1}$$

then as n goes to infinity, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left\| P(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) - p(z^n) \prod_{t=1}^T p_{[1:2^{nR_t}]}^U(b_t) \right\|_1 \to 0. \tag{2}$$

Remark 2 *In [10], the* channel intrinsic randomness *was defined "as the maximum random bit rate that can be extracted from a channel output independently of an input with known statistics". One can generalize this definition to the broadcast channel $p_{X_{[1:T]}|Z}$, in the sense of finding random bit rates $(R_1, \cdots, R_T)$ that can be extracted individually from the channel outputs independently of the channel input and the other random bits. Theorem 1 gives an achievable rate region for this scenario and implies that random binning is sufficient to prove the achievability.*[2]

Theorem 1 enables us to approximate the pmf $P(z^n, b_{1:T})$. We now consider another region for which we can approximate a specified pmf. This region is the Slepian-Wolf region for reconstructing $X_{[1:T]}^n$ in the presence of $(B_{1:T}, Z^n)$ at the decoder. As in the achievability proof of the [12, Lemma 7.2.1], we can define a decoder with respect to any fixed distributed binning. We denote the decoder by the random conditional pmf $P^{SW}(\hat{x}_{[1:T]}^n|z^n, b_{[1:T]})$ (note that since the decoder is a function, this pmf takes only two values, 0 and 1). Now we write the Slepian-Wolf theorem in the following equivalent form.

Lemma 1 *If for each $\mathcal{S} \subseteq [1 : T]$, the following constraint holds*

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{S}} R_t > H(X_{\mathcal{S}}|X_{\mathcal{S}^c}, Z), \tag{3}$$

---

[1] We are using capital letter P on the left hand side since the pmf induced on $x_{[1:T]}^n, z^n, b_{[1:T]}$ is random.

[2] In fact, [10] considered the case of a "general channel" and a "general input" (as defined in [12]) and proved their results using the information spectrum methods. However, we observe that the general form of the theorem proved in the appendix generalizes to this setting and shows that one should substitute average entropy with the *spectral inf-entropy*, [12] to get the result for the general case.

then as n goes to infinity, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left\|P(x^n_{[1:T]},z^n,\hat{x}^n_{[1:T]})-p(x^n_{[1:T]},z^n)\mathbf{1}\{\hat{x}^n_{[1:T]}=x^n_{[1:T]}\}\right\|_1\to 0.$$

Proof: From the definition of the total variation, we know that $\|p(x)-q(x)\|_1=\sum_{x:p(x)\geq q(x)}[p(x)-q(x)]$. Using this property we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left\|P(x^n_{[1:T]},z^n,\hat{x}^n_{[1:T]})-p(x^n_{[1:T]},z^n)\mathbf{1}\{\hat{x}^n_{[1:T]}=x^n_{[1:T]}\}\right\|_1 &\overset{(a)}{=}\mathbb{E}\sum_{\substack{x^n_{[1:T]},z^n,\hat{x}^n_{[1:T]}:\\ \hat{x}^n_{[1:T]}\neq x^n_{[1:T]}}}P(x^n_{[1:T]},z^n,\hat{x}^n_{[1:T]})\\ &=\mathbb{E}P(\hat{X}^n_{[1:T]}\neq X^n_{[1:T]})\to 0, \qquad (4)\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the fact that whenever $P(x^n_{[1:T]},z^n,\hat{x}^n_{[1:T]})\geq p(x^n_{[1:T]},z^n)\mathbf{1}\{\hat{x}^n_{[1:T]}=x^n_{[1:T]}\}$ we must have $\mathbf{1}\{\hat{x}^n_{[1:T]}=x^n_{[1:T]}\}=0$. To see this note that $P(x^n_{[1:T]},z^n,\hat{x}^n_{[1:T]})=p(x^n_{[1:T]},z^n)P(\hat{x}^n_{[1:T]}|x^n_{[1:T]},z^n)$. ■

III. ACHIEVABILITY PROOF THROUGH PROBABILITY APPROXIMATION

In this section, we illustrate the use of Theorem 1 and Slepian-Wolf binning (Lemma 1) through some examples. Before going through these examples, we state two useful lemmas on total variation of arbitrary (random) pmfs.

Definition 1 *For any random pmfs P_X and Q_X on $\mathcal{X}$, we say $P_X\overset{\epsilon}{\approx}Q_X$ if $\mathbb{E}\|P_X-Q_X\|_1<\epsilon$. Similarly we use $p_X\overset{\epsilon}{\approx}q_x$ for two (non-random) pmfs to denote the total variation constraint $\|p_X-q_X\|_1<\epsilon$.*

Lemma 2 *We have*

1) *[13, Lemma 17]:* $\left\|p_Xp_{Y|X}-q_Xp_{Y|X}\right\|_1=\|p_X-q_X\|_1$
   [13, Lemma 16]: $\|p_X-q_X\|_1\leq\left\|p_Xp_{Y|X}-q_Xq_{Y|X}\right\|_1$.
2) *If $p_Xp_{Y|X}\overset{\epsilon}{\approx}q_Xq_{Y|X}$, then there exists $x\in\mathcal{X}$ such that $p_{Y|X=x}\overset{2\epsilon}{\approx}q_{Y|X=x}$.*
   $2')$ *More generally the probability of the set $\{x\in\mathcal{X}:p_{Y|X=x}\overset{\sqrt{\epsilon}}{\approx}q_{Y|X=x}\}$ under both p_X and q_X is at least $1-2\sqrt{\epsilon}$.*
3) *If $P_X\overset{\epsilon}{\approx}Q_X$ and $P_XP_{Y|X}\overset{\delta}{\approx}P_XQ_{Y|X}$, then $P_XP_{Y|X}\overset{\epsilon+\delta}{\approx}Q_XQ_{Y|X}$.*

Proof: The proof of the first part can be found in [13]. Next consider the second part. To prove this, we bound above the expectation $\mathbb{E}_{p_X}\left\|p_{Y|X}-q_{Y|X}\right\|_1$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{p_X}\left\|p_{Y|X}-q_{Y|X}\right\|_1&=\sum_x p_X(x)\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_y\left|p_{Y|X}(y|x)-q_{Y|X}(y|x)\right|\right)\\ &\leq\frac{1}{2}\sum_{x,y}\left|p_X(x)p_{Y|X}(y|x)-q_X(x)q_{Y|X}(y|x)\right|+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{x,y}\left|q_X(x)q_{Y|X}(y|x)-p_X(x)q_{Y|X}(y|x)\right|\\ &=\left\|p_Xp_{Y|X}-q_Xq_{Y|X}\right\|_1+\left\|q_Xq_{Y|X}-p_Xq_{Y|X}\right\|_1\\ &\overset{(a)}{=}\left\|p_Xp_{Y|X}-q_Xq_{Y|X}\right\|_1+\|q_X-p_X\|_1\\ &\overset{(b)}{\leq}2\left\|p_Xp_{Y|X}-q_Xq_{Y|X}\right\|_1\\ &\leq 2\epsilon, \qquad (5)\end{aligned}$$

where in the steps (a) and (b) we use the first part of this lemma. Thus there exists a specified $x \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $2)$ hold. To show $2')$ we use Markov's inequality

$$p_X\left(\{x \in \mathcal{X} : \left\|p_{Y|X=x} - q_{Y|X=x}\right\|_1 > \sqrt{\epsilon}\}\right) \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{p_X}\left\|p_{Y|X} - q_{Y|X}\right\|_1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}} \leq 2\sqrt{\epsilon}.$$

Finally, consider the third part of the lemma. By the triangular inequality and the first part of the lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left\|P_XP_{Y|X} - Q_XQ_{Y|X}\right\|_1 &\leq \mathbb{E}\left\|P_XP_{Y|X} - P_XQ_{Y|X}\right\|_1 + \mathbb{E}\left\|P_XQ_{Y|X} - Q_XQ_{Y|X}\right\|_1\\ &= \mathbb{E}\left\|P_XP_{Y|X} - P_XQ_{Y|X}\right\|_1 + \mathbb{E}\left\|P_X - Q_X\right\|_1\\ &\leq \epsilon + \delta. \qquad (6)\end{aligned}$$

■

Lemma 3 *If* $d : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \to [0, d_{max}]$ *is a distortion measure,* p_{XY} *is a pmf with* $\mathbb{E}_{p_{XY}}d(X,Y) = D$ *and* q_{XY} *is a pmf such that* $q_{XY} \overset{\epsilon}{\approx} p_{XY}$, *then we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{q_{XY}}d(X,Y) \leq D + \epsilon d_{max}. \qquad (7)$$

Proof: We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{q_{XY}}d(X,Y) &= \sum_{x,y} q_{XY}(x,y)d(x,y)\\ &\leq \sum_{x,y} p_{XY}(x,y)d(x,y) + \sum_{x,y}\left|q_{XY}(x,y) - p_{XY}(x,y)\right| d(x,y)\\ &\leq D + d_{max}\sum_{x,y}\left|q_{XY}(x,y) - p_{XY}(x,y)\right|\\ &\leq D + \epsilon d_{\max} \qquad (8)\end{aligned}$$

■

A. Channel coding

Consider a channel with the conditional pmf $p(y|x)$. We want to prove that for any $p(x)$, $R < I(X;Y)$ is an achievable rate for the channel. Let $\mathcal{M} = [1 : 2^{nR}]$ be the message set. The joint pmf of (M, X^n, Y^n) is equal to $p^U_{\mathcal{M}}(m)p(x^n|m)p(y^n|x^n)$, where $p(x^n|m)$ can be non-deterministic (although it is deterministic in the standard definition) and M has uniform distribution due to the definition of channel coding. Here we want to determine $p(x^n|m)$ and a decoder such that we have reliable communication. In our approach, we let (X^n, Y^n) be i.i.d. and distributed according to $p(x,y)$. We define two random mappings on $\mathcal{X}^n$ as follows: to each x^n, we assign two random bin indices $m \in [1 : 2^{nR}]$ and $f \in [1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}}]$, uniformly and independently. Then the induced random pmf is

$$p(x^n, y^n)P(m|x^n)P(f|x^n) = P(m,f)P(x^n|m,f)p(y^n|x^n).$$

Now, Slepian-Wolf binning shows that if $\tilde{R} > H(X|Y)$, the decoder can reliably reconstruct X^n using (F, Y^n) and therefore decode M which is a function of X^n. Thus, for almost any $F = f$, the decoding is reliable. Hence, if the transmitter and receiver agree on an appropriate $F = f$, then we can choose $P(x^n|m, f)$ as the encoder and the Slepian-Wolf decoder as a decoder. Note that $P(y^n|x^n, F = f) = p(y^n|x^n)$, so conditioning on f simulates a DMC channel. However, notice that after conditioning on $F = f$, $P(m|f)$ is not necessarily uniform. But if $R + \tilde{R} < H(X)$, Theorem 1 implies that M has uniform distribution and roughly speaking, is independent of F. Hence $R < I(X; Y)$ is achievable using this encoder and decoder.

To set up a general proof structure that we will use consistently throughout this paper, we restate the above proof in the following framework:

The proof is divided into three parts. In the first part we introduce two protocols each of which induces a pmf on a certain set of r.v.'s. The first protocol has a negligible probability of error but leads to no concrete coding algorithm. However the second protocol is suitable for construction of a code, with one exception: the second protocol is assisted with a common randomness that does not really exist in the model. In the second part we find constraints implying that the two induced distributions are almost identical. In the third part of the proof, we eliminate the common randomness given to the second protocol without disturbing the probability of error significantly. This makes the second protocol useful for code construction.

Part (1) of the proof: Take some arbitrary $p(x)$. We define two protocols each of which induces a joint distribution on random variables that are defined during the protocol.

Protocol A. Let (X^n, Y^n) be i.i.d. and distributed according to $p(x, y) = p(x)p(y|x)$.

Random Binning: Consider the following random binning: to each sequence x^n, assign uniformly and independently two bin indices $m \in [1 : 2^{nR}]$ and $f \in [1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}}]$. Further, we use a Slepian-Wolf decoder to recover x^n from (y^n, f). We denote the output of the decoder by $\hat{x}^n$. The rate constraint for the success of the decoder will be discussed later, although this decoder can be conceived even when there is no guarantee of success.

The random [3] pmf induced by the random binning, denoted by P, can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P(x^n, y^n, m, f, \hat{x}^n) &= p(x^n, y^n)P(m, f|x^n)P^{SW}(\hat{x}^n|y^n, f) \\ &= P(m, f, x^n)p(y^n|x^n)P^{SW}(\hat{x}^n|y^n, f) \\ &= P(m, f)P(x^n|m, f)p(y^n|x^n)P^{SW}(\hat{x}^n|y^n, f). \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Protocol B. In this protocol we assume that the transmitter and the receiver have access to the shared randomness F where F is uniformly distributed over $[1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}}]$. Then, the protocol proceeds as follows:

- The transmitter chooses a message m uniformly distributed over $[1 : 2^{nR}]$ and independently of F.
- In the second stage, knowing (m, f), the transmitter generates a sequence x^n according to the conditional pmf $P(x^n|m, f)$ of the protocol A. Then it sends x^n over the channel.

---

[3] The pmf is random due to the random binning assignment in the protocol.

- At the final stage, the receiver, knowing (y^n, f) uses the Slepian-Wolf decoder $P^{SW}(\hat{x}^n|y^n, f)$ of protocol A to obtain an estimate of x^n.

The random pmf induced by the protocol, denoted by $\hat{P}$, factors as

$$\hat{P}(x^n, y^n, m, f, \hat{x}^n) = p^U(f)p^U(m)P(x^n|m, f)p(y^n|x^n)P^{SW}(\hat{x}^n|y^n, f) \tag{10}$$

Part (2a) of the proof: Sufficient conditions that make the induced pmfs approximately the same: To find the constraints that imply that the pmf $\hat{P}$ is close to the pmf P in total variation distance, we start with P and make it close to $\hat{P}$ in a few steps. The first step is to observe that m and f are the bin indices of x^n in Protocol A. Theorem 1 implies that if $R+\tilde{R} < H(X)$ then there exists $\epsilon_n \to 0$ such that $P(m, f) \overset{\epsilon_n}{\approx} p^U(m)p^U(f) = \hat{P}(m, f)$. Equations (9) and (10) imply

$$\hat{P}(m, f, x^n, y^n, \hat{x}^n) \overset{\epsilon_n}{\approx} P(m, f, x^n, y^n, \hat{x}^n) \tag{11}$$

Part (2b) of the proof: Sufficient conditions that make the Slepian-Wolf decoder succeed: The next step is to see that for the Slepian-Wolf decoder of protocol A to work well. Lemma 1 requires imposing the constraint $\tilde{R} > H(X|Y)$. It yields that for some vanishing sequence δ_n, we have

$$P(m, f, x^n, y^n, \hat{x}^n) \overset{\delta_n}{\approx} P(m, f, x^n, y^n)\mathbf{1}\{\hat{x}^n = x^n\}. \tag{12}$$

Using equations (11), (12) and the third part of Lemma 2 we have

$$\hat{P}(m, f, x^n, y^n, \hat{x}^n) \overset{\epsilon_n+\delta_n}{\approx} P(m, f, x^n, y^n)\mathbf{1}\{\hat{x}^n = x^n\}. \tag{13}$$

Part (3) of the proof: Eliminating the shared randomness In the protocol we assumed that the transmitter and the receiver have access to shared randomness F which is not present in the model. Nevertheless, we show that the transmitter and the receiver can agree on an instance f of F. Using Definition 1, equation (13) guarantees the existence of a fixed binning with the corresponding pmf p such that if we replace P with p in (10) and denote the resulting pmf with $\hat{p}$, then $\hat{p}(m, f, x^n, y^n, \hat{x}^n) \overset{\epsilon_n+\delta_n}{\approx} p(m, f, x^n, y^n)\mathbf{1}\{\hat{x}^n = x^n\}$. Now, the second part of Lemma 2 shows that there exists an instance f such that $\hat{p}(m, x^n, y^n, \hat{x}^n|f) \overset{2(\epsilon_n+\delta_n)}{\approx} p(m, x^n, y^n|f)\mathbf{1}\{\hat{x}^n = x^n\}$. Using the second item in part 1 of Lemma 2 we conclude that $\hat{p}(x^n, \hat{x}^n|f) \overset{2(\epsilon_n+\delta_n)}{\approx} \mathbf{1}\{\hat{x}^n = x^n\}$ which is equivalent to $\hat{p}(X^n \neq \hat{X}^n|f) \leq 2(\epsilon_n + \delta_n)$. Reliable recovery of the transmitted X^n implies reliable recovery of the message M.

Finally, identifying $p(x^n|m, f)$ as the encoder and $p^{SW}(\hat{x}^n|y^n, f)$ as the decoder results in a pair of encoder-decoder with the probability of error at most $2(\epsilon_n + \delta_n)$.

B. Lossy source coding

Problem definition: Consider the problem of lossy compression of a source within a desired distortion. In this setting, there is an i.i.d. source X^n distributed according to $p(x)$, an (stochastic) encoder mapping $\mathcal{X}^n$ to $M \in [1 : 2^{nR}]$, a decoder that reconstructs a lossy version of X^n (namely Y^n) and a distortion measure $d : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \to [0, d_{max}]$.

A rate R is said to be achievable at the distortion D, if $\mathbb{E}(d(X^n, Y^n)) \leq D + \epsilon_n$, where $\epsilon_n \to 0$ and $d(X^n, Y^n)$ is the average per letter distortion.

Statement: Here we wish to reprove the known result on the achievability of the rate $R > I(X;Y)$ for any $p(x, y)$ where $\mathbb{E}d(X, Y) < D$.

Overview of the proof: Note that the joint pmf between (X^n, M, Y^n) factors as $p(x^n)p(m|x^n)p(y^n|m)$. The goal is to determine $p(m|x^n)$ and $p(y^n|m)$ as the pair of encoder-decoder. As the case of channel coding, let (X^n, Y^n) be i.i.d. and distributed according to $p(x, y)$. We have $\mathbb{E}_{p(x^n,y^n)}d(X^n, Y^n) = \mathbb{E}d(X, Y) < D$. Again, to each y^n, we assign two random bins m and f at the rates R and $\tilde{R}$, respectively. Since the decoder aims to produce Y^n which has the desired distortion with X^n, we assume that $R+\tilde{R} > H(Y)$ resulting in reliable decoding of Y^n from (M, F). Hence, we expect that if the encoder and decoder agree on an appropriate value of $F = f$, the decoder can reliably recover Y^n using the S-W decoder. However, conditioning on $F = f$ changes the distribution $p(x^n)$ to $P(x^n|f)$ and we obtain an scheme that achieves distortion D w.r.t. $P(x^n|f)$ rather than $p(x^n)$. Despite this fact, roughly speaking, Theorem 1 says that F and X^n are independent and $P(x^n|f)$ is close to $p(x^n)$ if $\tilde{R} < H(Y|X)$. Hence, we can choose the encoder-decoder w.r.t. $P(x^n|f)$ for $p(x^n)$.

Proof: Take some arbitrary $p(x, y)$ where $\mathbb{E}d(X, Y) < D$. The proof is again divided into three parts. In the first part we introduce two protocols each of which induces a pmf on a certain set of r.v.'s. The first protocol has the desired distortion property but leads to no concrete coding algorithm. However the second protocol is suitable for construction of a code, with one exception: the second protocol is assisted with a common randomness that does not really exist in the model. In the second part we find constraints implying that the two induced distributions are almost identical. In the third part of the proof, we eliminate the common randomness given to the second protocol without disturbing the distortion significantly. This makes the second protocol useful for code construction.

Part (1) of the proof: We define two protocols each of which induces a joint distribution on random variables that are defined during the protocol.

Protocol A. Let (X^n, Y^n) be i.i.d. and distributed according to $p(x, y)$.

Random Binning: Consider the following random binning: to each sequence y^n, assign uniformly and independently two bin indices $m \in [1 : 2^{nR}]$ and $f \in [1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}}]$. Further, we use a Slepian-Wolf decoder to recover y^n from (m, f). We denote the output of the decoder by $\hat{y}^n$. The rate constraint for the success of the decoder will be discussed later, although this decoder can be conceived even when there is no guarantee of success.

The random pmf induced by the random binning, denoted by P, can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} P(x^n, y^n, m, f, \hat{y}^n) &= p(x^n, y^n)P(f|y^n)P(m|y^n)P^{SW}(\hat{y}^n|m, f) \\ &= P(f, x^n, y^n)P(m|y^n)P^{SW}(\hat{y}^n|m, f) \\ &= P(f, x^n)P(y^n|x^n, f)P(m|y^n)P^{SW}(\hat{y}^n|m, f). \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Protocol B. In this protocol we assume that the transmitter and the receiver have access to the shared randomness F where F is uniformly distributed over $[1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}}]$. Then, the protocol proceeds as follows:

- The transmitter generates Y^n according to the conditional pmf $P(y^n|x^n, f)$ of protocol A.

- Next, knowing y^n, the transmitter sends m which is the bin index of y^n. Random variable M is generated according to the conditional pmf $P(m|y^n)$ of protocol A.
- At the final stage, the receiver, knowing (m, f) uses the Slepian-Wolf decoder $P^{SW}(\hat{y}^n|m, f)$ of protocol A to obtain an estimate of y^n.

The random pmf induced by the protocol, denoted by $\hat{P}$, factors as

$$\hat{P}(x^n, y^n, m, f, \hat{y}^n) = p^U(f)p(x^n)P(y^n|x^n, f)P(m|y^n)P^{SW}(\hat{y}^n|m, f) \tag{15}$$

Part (2a) of the proof: Sufficient conditions that make the induced pmfs approximately the same: To find the constraints that imply that the pmf $\hat{P}$ is close to the pmf P in total variation distance, we start with P and make it close to $\hat{P}$ in a few steps. The first step is to observe that f is a bin index of y^n in protocol A. Theorem 1 implies that if $\tilde{R} < H(Y|X)$ then there exists $\epsilon_n \to 0$ such that $P(f, x^n) \overset{\epsilon_n}{\approx} p^U(f)p(x^n) = \hat{P}(f, x^n)$. Equations (14) and (15) imply

$$\hat{P}(m, f, x^n, y^n, \hat{y}^n) \overset{\epsilon_n}{\approx} P(m, f, x^n, y^n, \hat{y}^n) \tag{16}$$

Part (2b) of the proof: Sufficient conditions that make the Slepian-Wolf decoder succeed: The next step is to see that for the Slepian-Wolf decoder of protocol A to work well. Lemma 1 requires imposing the constraint $R + \tilde{R} > H(Y)$. It yields that for some vanishing sequence δ_n, we have

$$P(m, f, x^n, y^n, \hat{y}^n) \overset{\delta_n}{\approx} P(m, f, x^n, y^n)\mathbf{1}\{\hat{y}^n = y^n\}. \tag{17}$$

Using equations (16), (17) and the third part of Lemma 2 we have

$$\hat{P}(m, f, x^n, y^n, \hat{y}^n) \overset{\epsilon_n+\delta_n}{\approx} P(m, f, x^n, y^n)\mathbf{1}\{\hat{y}^n = y^n\}. \tag{18}$$

Part (3) of the proof: Eliminating the shared randomness: In the protocol we assumed that the transmitter and the receiver have access to shared randomness F which is not present in the model. Nevertheless, we show that the transmitter and the receiver can agree on an instance f of F. Using Definition 1, equation (18) guarantees existence of a fixed binning with the corresponding pmf p such that if we replace P with p in (15) and denote the resulting pmf with $\hat{p}$, then $\hat{p}(m, f, x^n, y^n, \hat{y}^n) \overset{\epsilon_n+\delta_n}{\approx} p(m, f, x^n, y^n)\mathbf{1}\{\hat{y}^n = y^n\} := \tilde{p}(m, f, x^n, y^n, \hat{y}^n)$. Using the second item of part one of Lemma 2, we have $\hat{p}(x^n, \hat{y}^n) \overset{\epsilon_n+\delta_n}{\approx} \tilde{p}(x^n, \hat{y}^n) = p_{X^nY^n}(x^n, \hat{y}^n)$.

Applying lemma 3 to $\tilde{p}_{X^n\hat{Y}^n}$ and $\hat{p}_{X^nY^n}$ and noting that $\mathbb{E}_{p_{X^nY^n}(x^n,\hat{y}^n)}d(X^n, \hat{Y}^n) < D$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{p}(x^n,\hat{y}^n)}d(X^n, \hat{Y}^n) < D,$$

for sufficiently large n. Using the law of iterated expectation, we conclude that there exists an $F = f$ such that $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{p}(x^n,\hat{y}^n|f)}d(X^n, \hat{Y}^n) < D$.

Finally, specifying $p(m|x^n, f)$ as the encoder (which is equivalent to generating a random sequence y^n according to $p(y^n|x^n, f)$ and then transmitting the bin index m assigned to y^n) and $p^{SW}(\hat{y}^n|m, f)$ as the decoder results in a pair of encoder-decoder obeying the desired distortion.

C. Lossy coding over broadcast channels

Problem definition: Consider the problem of lossy transmission of an i.i.d. source S^n distributed according to $p(s)$, over the broadcast channel $p(y_1, y_2|x)$. Here, the sender wishes to communicate the source to the two receivers within desired distortions (D_1, D_2). Formally, there are

- an encoder that assigns a random sequence x^n to each s^n according to $p^{enc}(x^n|s^n)$,
- two decoders, where decoder $j = 1, 2$ assigns an estimate $\hat{s}_j^n \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_j$ to each y_j^n according to $p^{dec_j}(\hat{s}_j^n|y_j^n)$,
- two distortion measures $d_j(s, \hat{s}_j)$.

A distortion pair (D_1, D_2) is said to be achievable, if there exists a sequence of encoder-decoder such that $\mathbb{E}d_j(S^n, \hat{S}_j^n) \leq D_j + \epsilon_n$, $j = 1, 2$ and $\epsilon_n \to 0$.

We now state a new result on the above problem:

Theorem 2 *A distortion pair (D_1, D_2) is achievable for the lossy transmission of the source S over the broadcast channel $p(y_1 y_2|x)$, if there exist a pmf $p(u_{[0:2]})$, an encoding function $x(u_{[0:2]}, s)$ and two decoding functions $\hat{s}_1(u_0, u_1, y_1)$ and $\hat{s}_2(u_0, u_2, y_2)$ such that $\mathbb{E}d_j(S, \hat{S}_j) \leq D_j$, $j = 1, 2$ and the following inequalities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} I(U_0U_j; S) &< I(U_0U_j; Y_j) \quad , j = 1, 2, \\ I(U_{[0:2]}; S) + I(U_1; U_2|U_0) &< \min\{I(U_0; Y_1), I(U_0; Y_2)\} \\ &\quad + I(U_1; Y_1|U_0) + I(U_2; Y_2|U_0), \\ I(U_0U_1; S) + I(U_0U_2; S) &< I(U_0U_1; Y_1) + I(U_0U_2; Y_2) \\ &\quad - I(U_1; U_2|U_0S). \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Remark 3 *The above result is related to the result of Han and Costa, [16], [14] for the lossless transmission of correlated sources over broadcast channels when S is of the form (S_1, S_2). In this case we can include S_1 in U_1, and S_2 in U_2. If we take the distortion function to be the hamming distance function, the above bound reduces to a weaker version of the result of Han and Costa since instead of a vanishing probability of error we have a vanishing distortion. However the proof can be modified to recover the result of [14].*

Proof: Take some arbitrary $p(s, u_{[0:2]}, y_1, y_2)$ and functions $x(u_{[0:2]}, s)$, $\hat{s}_1(u_0, u_1, y_1)$ and $\hat{s}_2(u_0, u_2, y_2)$ such that $\mathbb{E}d_j(S, \hat{S}_j) < D_j$, $j = 1, 2$. The proof is again divided into three parts. In the first part we introduce two protocols each of which induces a pmf on a certain set of r.v.'s. The first protocol has the desired distortion properties but leads to no concrete coding algorithm. However the second protocol is suitable for construction of a code, with one exception: the second protocol is assisted with a common randomness that does not really exist in the model. In the second part we find constraints implying that the two induced distributions are almost identical. In the third part of the proof, we eliminate the common randomness given to the second protocol without disturbing the distortion significantly. This makes the second protocol useful for code construction.

Part (1) of the proof: We define two protocols each of which induces a joint distribution on random variables that are defined during the protocol.

Protocol A. Let $(S^n, U_{[0:2]}^n, Y_1^n, Y_2^n)$ be i.i.d. and distributed according to $p(s, u_{[0:2]}, y_1, y_2)$.

Random Binning: Consider the following random binning:

- To each sequence u_0^n assign uniformly and independently a random bin index $f_0 \in [1:2^{nR_0}]$,
- For $j = 1, 2$, to each pair (u_0^n, u_j^n) assign uniformly and independently a random bin index $f_j \in [1:2^{nR_j}]$,
- We use a Slepian-Wolf decoder to recover $\hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n$ from (y_1^n, f_0, f_1), and another Slepian-Wolf decoder to recover $\hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n$ from (y_2^n, f_0, f_2). Note that we denote the two estimates of u_0^n by the two receivers with $\hat{u}_{0,1}^n$ and $\hat{u}_{0,2}^n$. The rate constraints for the success of these decoders will be imposed later, although these decoders can be conceived even when there is no guarantee of success.
- Random variable $\hat{s}_1^n$ is created as a function of $(\hat{u}_0^n, \hat{u}_1^n, y_1^n)$ and $\hat{s}_2^n$ is created as function of $(\hat{u}_0^n, \hat{u}_2^n, y_2^n)$ using the two decoding functions given at the beginning.

The random pmf induced by the random binning, denoted by P, can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
P(s^n, u_{[0:2]}^n, y_1^n, y_2^n, f_{[0:2]}, \hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, \hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n) &= p(s^n, u_{[0:2]}^n, y_1^n, y_2^n) P(f_{[0:2]}|u_{[0:2]}^n) P^{SW}(\hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n | y_1^n, f_0, f_1) \\
&\quad \times P^{SW}(\hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n | y_2^n, f_0, f_2) \\
&= P(f_{[0:2]}, s^n, u_{[0:2]}^n) p(y_{[1:2]}^n | u_{[0:2]}^n, s^n) P^{SW}(\hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n | y_1^n, f_0, f_1) \\
&\quad \times P^{SW}(\hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n | y_2^n, f_0, f_2) \\
&= P(f_{[0:2]}, s^n) P(u_{[0:2]}^n | f_{[0:2]}, s^n) p(y_{[1:2]}^n | u_{[0:2]}^n, s^n) P^{SW}(\hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n | y_1^n, f_0, f_1) \\
&\quad \times P^{SW}(\hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n | y_2^n, f_0, f_2). \qquad (20)
\end{aligned}$$

We have ignored $\hat{s}_1^n$ and $\hat{s}_2^n$ from the pmf at this stage since they are functions of other random variables. They will be introduced later.

Protocol B. In this protocol we assume that the transmitter and the two receivers have access to the shared randomness $F_{[0:2]}$ where $F_{[0:2]}$ is uniformly distributed over $[1:2^{n\tilde{R}_0}] \times [1:2^{n\tilde{R}_1}] \times [1:2^{n\tilde{R}_2}]$. Observe that this implies that F_0, F_1 and F_2 are mutually independent. Then, the protocol proceeds as follows:

- The transmitter generates $U_{[0:2]}^n$ according to the conditional pmf $P(u_{[0:2]}^n | s^n, f_{[0:2]})$ of protocol A.
- Next, X^n is computed from $(U_{[0:2]}^n, S^n)$ using n copies of the function $x(u_{[0:2]}, s)$ (the arbitrary function we chose at the beginning). R.v. X^n is transmitted over the broadcast channel.
- At the final stage, the receiver $j = 1, 2$, knowing (y_j^n, f_0, f_j) uses the Slepian-Wolf decoder $P^{SW}(\hat{u}_{0,j}^n, \hat{u}_j^n | y_j^n, f_0, f_j)$ of protocol A to obtain estimates of u_0^n and u_j^n. We note that while the receiver $j = 1, 2$ knows f_0, f_1 and f_2, it uses only f_0, f_j in its Slepian-Wolf decoder.
- Random variable $\hat{s}_1^n$ is created as a function of $(\hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, y_1^n)$ and $\hat{s}_2^n$ is created as function of $(\hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n, y_2^n)$ using the two decoding functions given at the beginning.

The random pmf induced by the protocol, denoted by $\hat{P}$, factors as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{P}(s^n, u_{[0:2]}^n, y_1^n, y_2^n, f_{[0:2]}, \hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, \hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n) = \\
&p^U(f_{[0:2]}) p(s^n) P(u_{[0:2]}^n | s^n, f_{[0:2]}) p(y_{[1:2]}^n | u_{[0:2]}^n, s^n) P^{SW}(\hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n | y_1^n, f_0, f_1) P^{SW}(\hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n | y_2^n, f_0, f_2). \qquad (21)
\end{aligned}$$

Again we have ignored $\hat{s}_1^n$ and $\hat{s}_2^n$ from the pmf at this stage since they are functions of other random variables.

Part (2a) of the proof: Sufficient conditions that make the induced pmfs approximately the same: To find the constraints that imply that the pmf $\hat{P}$ is close to the pmf P in total variation distance, we start with P and make it close to $\hat{P}$ in a few steps. The first step is to observe that in protocol A, f_0 is a bin index of u_0^n, f_1 is a bin index of (u_0^n, u_1^n) and f_2 is a bin index of (u_0^n, u_2^n). Substituting $X_1 = U_0, X_2 = U_0U_j, Z = S$ in Theorem 1 implies that S^n is nearly independent of $F_{[0:2]}$ and that its pmf is close to $p(s^n)$, if

$$\begin{aligned} R_0 &< H(U_0|S), \\ R_0 + R_j &< H(U_0U_j|S)\ , j = 1, 2, \\ R_0 + R_1 + R_2 &< H(U_{[0:2]}|S). \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

In other words, the above constraints imply that there exists $\epsilon_n \to 0$ such that $P(f_{[0:2]}, s^n) \overset{\epsilon_n}{\approx} p^U(f_{[0:2]})p(s^n) = \hat{P}(f_{[0:2]}, s^n)$. Equations (20) and (21) imply

$$\hat{P}(s^n, u_{[0:2]}^n, y_1^n, y_2^n, f_{[0:2]}, \hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, \hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n) \overset{\epsilon_n}{\approx} P(s^n, u_{[0:2]}^n, y_1^n, y_2^n, f_{[0:2]}, \hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, \hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n) \tag{23}$$

Part (2b) of the proof: Sufficient conditions that make the Slepian-Wolf decoder succeed: The next step is to see that for the Slepian-Wolf decoder of protocol A to work well. Lemma 1 for $X_1 = U_0, X_2 = U_0U_j, Z = Y_j$ yields that the decoding of $U_0^nU_j^n$ is reliable if,

$$\begin{aligned} R_0 + R_j &> H(U_0U_j|Y_j), \\ R_j &> H(U_j|U_0Y_j) \ \text{ for } j = 1, 2. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

It yields that for some vanishing sequence δ_n, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(s^n, u_{[0:2]}^n, y_1^n, y_2^n, f_{[0:2]}, \hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, \hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n) &\overset{\delta_n}{\approx} P(s^n, u_{[0:2]}^n, y_1^n, y_2^n, f_{[0:2]}) \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{1}\{\hat{u}_{0,1}^n = \hat{u}_{0,2}^n = u_0^n, \hat{u}_1^n = u_1^n, \hat{u}_2^n = u_2^n\}. \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Using equations (23), (25) and the third part of Lemma 2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}(s^n, u_{[0:2]}^n, y_1^n, y_2^n, f_{[0:2]}, \hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, \hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n) &\overset{\epsilon_n+\delta_n}{\approx} P(s^n, u_{[0:2]}^n, y_1^n, y_2^n, f_{[0:2]}) \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{1}\{\hat{u}_{0,1}^n = \hat{u}_{0,2}^n = u_0^n, \hat{u}_1^n = u_1^n, \hat{u}_2^n = u_2^n\}. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Part (3) of the proof: Eliminating the shared randomness: In the protocol we assumed that the transmitter and the two receivers have access to shared randomness $F_{[0:2]}$ which is not present in the model. Nevertheless, we show that the transmitter and the receivers can agree on an instance $f_{[0:2]}$ of $F_{[0:2]}$. Using Definition 1, equation (26) guarantees existence of a fixed binning with the corresponding pmf p such that if we replace P with p in (21) and denote the resulting pmf with $\hat{p}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{p}(s^n, u_{[0:2]}^n, y_1^n, y_2^n, f_{[0:2]}, \hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, \hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n) &\overset{\epsilon_n+\delta_n}{\approx} p(s^n, u_{[0:2]}^n, y_1^n, y_2^n, f_{[0:2]}) \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{1}\{\hat{u}_{0,1}^n = \hat{u}_{0,2}^n = u_0^n, \hat{u}_1^n = u_1^n, \hat{u}_2^n = u_2^n\} \\ &:= \tilde{p}(s^n, u_{[0:2]}^n, y_1^n, y_2^n, f_{[0:2]}, \hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, \hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n). \end{aligned}$$

Using part one of lemma 2 we can introduce $\hat{s}_1$ and $\hat{s}_2$ in the above equation. Random variable $\hat{s}_1^n$ was a function of $(\hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, y_1^n)$ and $\hat{s}_2^n$ was function of $(\hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n, y_2^n)$.

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{p}(s^n, u_{[0:2]}^n, y_1^n, y_2^n, f_{[0:2]}, \hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, \hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n, \hat{s}_1^n, \hat{s}_2^n) &\overset{\epsilon_n+\delta_n}{\approx} p(s^n, u_{[0:2]}^n, y_1^n, y_2^n, f_{[0:2]}) \\ &\quad \times \mathbf{1}\{\hat{u}_{0,1}^n = \hat{u}_{0,2}^n = u_0^n, \hat{u}_1^n = u_1^n, \hat{u}_2^n = u_2^n\} \\ &\quad \times p(\hat{s}_1^n|\hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, y_1^n)p(\hat{s}_2^n|\hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, y_1^n) \\ &:= \tilde{p}(s^n, u_{[0:2]}^n, y_1^n, y_2^n, f_{[0:2]}, \hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, \hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n, \hat{s}_1^n, \hat{s}_2^n).\end{aligned}$$

Note that because of the indicator function terms in $\tilde{p}$, $\tilde{p}(S^n, \hat{S}_1^n, \hat{S}_2^n)$ is an i.i.d. marginal distribution according to the pmf that we started with at the beginning. Thus, under the probability measure $\tilde{p}$ the distortion constraints $\mathbb{E}d_j(S^n, \hat{S}_j^n) < D_j,\ j = 1, 2$ are satisfied. Using the first part of lemma 2 we can drop all the random variables except $s^n, \hat{s}_1^n, \hat{s}_2^n$ to get:

$$\hat{p}(s^n, \hat{s}_1^n, \hat{s}_2^n) \overset{\epsilon_n+\delta_n}{\approx} \tilde{p}(s^n, \hat{s}_1^n, \hat{s}_2^n). \tag{27}$$

Remember that the pmf $\hat{p}$ corresponded to Protocol B which was appropriate for coding.

Unlike the previous case of lossy source coding where we used the law of iterated expectation at this stage, we need to use a concentration result since we are dealing with two distortion functions. Since $\tilde{p}(S^n, \hat{S}_1^n, \hat{S}_2^n)$ is an i.i.d. distribution we can use the weak law of large number (WLLN) to get that

$$d_j(S^n, \hat{S}_j^n) \to \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{p}} d_j(S^n, \hat{S}_j^n) < D_j, \quad \text{in } \tilde{p}_{S^n \hat{S}_j^n}.$$

Thus there exists $\tilde{\epsilon}_n \to 0$ such that

$$\tilde{p}\{(s^n, \hat{s}_1^n, \hat{s}_2^n) : d_j(s^n, \hat{s}_j^n) < D_j\ , j = 1, 2\} \geq 1 - \tilde{\epsilon}_n.$$

Using equation (27), the probability of the same set with respect to $\hat{p}$ should be converging to one, that is

$$\hat{p}\{(s^n, \hat{s}_1^n, \hat{s}_2^n) : d_j(s^n, \hat{s}_j^n) < D_j\ , j = 1, 2\} \geq 1 - \tilde{\epsilon}_n - \epsilon_n - \delta_n.$$

Thus, there exists some $f_{[0:2]}$ such that

$$\hat{p}(\{(s^n, \hat{s}_1^n, \hat{s}_2^n) : d_j(s^n, \hat{s}_j^n) < D_j\ , j = 1, 2\}|F_{[0:2]} = f_{[0:2]}) \geq 1 - \tilde{\epsilon}_n - \epsilon_n - \delta_n.$$

This would imply that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\hat{p}_{S^n \hat{S}_j^n | F_{[0:2]} = f_{[0:2]}}}[d(S^n, \hat{S}_j^n)]) < D_j + (\tilde{\epsilon}_n + \epsilon_n + \delta_n)d_{max}.$$

where we have used the fact that the distortion functions are bounded.

Specifying $(p(u_{[0:2]}^n|f_{[0:2]}, s^n), x^n(u_{[0:2]}^n, s^n))$ as the encoder and $(p^{SW}(\hat{u}_{0,j}, \hat{u}_j|y_j^n, f_0, f_j), \hat{s}_j^n(\hat{u}_{0,j}, \hat{u}_j, y_j^n))$ as the decoder j results in encoder and decoders obeying the desired distortions.

Finally applying Fourier-Motzkin elimination (FME) on (24) and (22) gives (19). ■

D. Wiretap broadcast channels with strong secrecy criterion

Problem definition: Consider the problem of secure transmission over a broadcast channel with a wiretapper, $p(y_1, y_2, z|x)$. Here, we wish to securely transmit a common message $m_0 \in [1 : 2^{nR_0}]$ to the receivers Y_1, Y_2 and two private messages $m_j \in [1 : 2^{nR_j}], j = 1, 2$ to the receivers $Y_j, j = 1, 2$, respectively, while concealing them from the wiretapper. We use the total variation distance as a measure for analyzing the secrecy. Formally speaking there are,

- Three messages M_0, M_1, M_2 which are mutually independent and uniformly distributed,
- A stochastic encoder $p^{enc}(x^n|m_{[0:2]})$,
- Two decoders, where decoder j assigns an estimate $(\hat{m}_{0,j}, \hat{m}_j)$ of (m_0, m_j) to each y_j^n.

A rate-tuple (R_0, R_1, R_2) is said to be achievable if $\Pr\{\cup_{j=1,2}(\hat{M}_{0,j}, \hat{M}_j) \neq (M_0, M_j)\} \to 0$ and $M_{[0:2]}$ is nearly independent of the wiretapper output, Z^n, that is,

$$\left\|p(m_{[0:2]}, z^n) - p^U_{\mathcal{M}_{[0:2]}}(m_{[0:2]})p(z^n)\right\|_1 \to 0,$$

where, here $p(z^n)$ is the induced pmf on Z^n and is not an i.i.d. pmf.

Remark 4 *The above total variation constraint is stronger than weak secrecy [10]. It is equivalent with strong secrecy when the above total variation distance converges to zero exponentially fast. we can modify our tools (Theorem 1 and Lemma 1) for* finite alphabets *to have an exponential decrease. However we are dealing with both finite and countable alphabet sets in this work.*

Theorem 3 *A rate-tuple (R_0, R_1, R_2) is achievable for the secure transmission over the wiretap broadcast channel, if it belongs to the convex hull of*

$$\begin{aligned} R_0 + R_j &< I(U_0U_j; Y_1|Q) - I(U_0U_j; Z|Q),\ j = 1, 2. \\ R_0 + R_1 + R_2 &< \min\{I(U_0; Y_1|Q), I(U_0; Y_2|Q)\} + I(U_1; Y_1|U_0, Q) \\ &\quad + I(U_2; Y_2|U_0, Q) - I(U_1; U_2|U_0, Q) - I(U_{[0:2]}; Z|Q) \\ 2R_0 + R_1 + R_2 &< I(U_0U_1; Y_1|Q) - I(U_0U_1; Z|Q) + I(U_0U_2; Y_2|Q) \\ &\quad - I(U_0U_2; Z|Q) - I(U_1; U_2|U_0, Z, Q) \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where $Q, U_{[0:2]} - X - (Y_1, Y_2, Z)$ forms a Markov chain.

Proof: For simplicity we consider the case where the time-sharing r.v. Q is a constant random variable. One can incorporate this into our proof by generating its i.i.d. copies, and sharing it among all parties and conditioning everything on it.

Take some arbitrary $p(u_{[0:2]}, x)p(y_1, y_2, z|x)$. The proof is again divided into three parts. In the first part we introduce two protocols each of which induces a pmf on a certain set of r.v.'s. The first protocol has the desired reliability and security properties but leads to no concrete coding algorithm. However the second protocol is suitable for construction of a code, with one exception: the second protocol is assisted with a common randomness that does not really exist in the model. In the second part we find constraints implying that the two induced distributions are almost identical. In the third part of the proof, we eliminate the common randomness given to the second protocol without disturbing the distortion significantly. This makes the second protocol useful for code construction.

Part (1) of the proof: We define two protocols each of which induces a joint distribution on random variables that are defined during the protocol.

Protocol A. Let $(U^n_{[0:2]}, X^n, Y^n_1, Y^n_2, Z^n)$ be i.i.d. and distributed according to $p(u_{[0:2]}, x, y_1, y_2, z)$.

Random Binning: Consider the following random binning:

- To each u^n_0 assign uniformly and independently two random bin indices $m_0 \in [1 : 2^{nR_0}]$ and $f_0 \in [1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}_0}]$,
- For $j = 1, 2$, to each pair (u^n_0, u^n_j) assign uniformly and independently two random bin indicies $m_j \in [1 : 2^{nR_j}]$ and $f_j \in [1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}_j}]$.
- We use a Slepian-Wolf decoder to recover $\hat{u}^n_{0,1}, \hat{u}^n_1$ from (y^n_1, f_0, f_1), and another Slepian-Wolf decoder to recover $\hat{u}^n_{0,2}, \hat{u}^n_2$ from (y^n_2, f_0, f_2). Note that we denote the two estimates of u^n_0 by the two receivers with $\hat{u}^n_{0,1}$ and $\hat{u}^n_{0,2}$. The rate constraints for the success of these decoders will be imposed later, although these decoders can be conceived even when there is no guarantee of success.

The random pmf induced by the random binning, denoted by P, can be expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
P(u^n_{[0:2]}, y^n_1, y^n_2, z^n, m_{[0:2]}, f_{[0:2]}, \hat{u}^n_{0,1}, \hat{u}^n_1, \hat{u}^n_{0,2}, \hat{u}^n_2) &= p(u^n_{[0:2]}, y^n_1, y^n_2, z^n) P(f_{[0:2]}|u^n_{[0:2]}) P(m_{[0:2]}|u^n_{[0:2]}) \\
&\quad \times P^{SW}(\hat{u}^n_{0,1}, \hat{u}^n_1|y^n_1, f_0, f_1) P^{SW}(\hat{u}^n_{0,2}, \hat{u}^n_2|y^n_2, f_0, f_2) \\
&= P(f_{[0:2]}, m_{[0:2]}, u^n_{[0:2]}) p(x^n|u^n_{[0:2]}) p(y^n_1, y^n_2, z^n|x^n) \\
&\quad \times P^{SW}(\hat{u}^n_{0,1}, \hat{u}^n_1|y^n_1, f_0, f_1) P^{SW}(\hat{u}^n_{0,2}, \hat{u}^n_2|y^n_2, f_0, f_2) \\
&= P(f_{[0:2]}, m_{[0:2]}) P(u^n_{[0:2]}|f_{[0:2]}, m_{[0:2]}) p(x^n|u^n_{[0:2]}) p(y^n_1, y^n_2, z^n|x^n) \\
&\quad \times P^{SW}(\hat{u}^n_{0,1}, \hat{u}^n_1|y^n_1, f_0, f_1) P^{SW}(\hat{u}^n_{0,2}, \hat{u}^n_2|y^n_2, f_0, f_2).
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Protocol B. In this protocol we assume that the transmitter, the two receivers and the wiretapper have access to the shared randomness $F_{[0:2]}$ where $F_{[0:2]}$ is uniformly distributed over $[1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}_0}] \times [1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}_1}] \times [1 : 2^{n\tilde{R}_2}]$. Observe that this implies that F_0, F_1 and F_2 are mutually independent. Then, the protocol proceeds as follows:

- The messages M_0, M_1 and M_2 are mutually independent of each other and of $F_{[0:2]}$, uniformly distributed over $[1 : 2^{nR_0}] \times [1 : 2^{nR_1}] \times [1 : 2^{nR_2}]$.
- The transmitter generates $U^n_{[0:2]}$ according to the conditional pmf $P(u^n_{[0:2]}|m_{[0:2]}, f_{[0:2]})$ of protocol A.
- Next, X^n is generated according to the n i.i.d. copies of the conditional pmf $p(x|u_{[0:2]})$ (computed from the arbitrary $p(x, u_{[0:2]})$ we chose at the beginning). R.v. X^n is transmitted over the broadcast channel.
- At the final stage, the receiver $j = 1, 2$, knowing (y^n_j, f_0, f_j) uses the Slepian-Wolf decoder $P^{SW}(\hat{u}^n_{0,j}, \hat{u}^n_j|y^n_j, f_0, f_j)$ of protocol A to obtain estimates of u^n_0 and u^n_j. We note that while the receiver $j = 1, 2$ knows f_0, f_1 and f_2, it uses only f_0, f_j in its Slepian-Wolf decoder.

- We use the output of the S-W decoder $j=1,2$ for decoding of the messages (M_0,M_j). In protocol A, we constructed M_0 as a bin index of U_0^n. Here the receiver j has an estimate of U_0^n which is denoted by $\hat{U}_{0,j}^n$. To find the estimate of M_0, the decoder can apply the same indexing pattern used in the random binning of U_0^n to the estimate $\hat{U}_{0,j}^n$. In other words, we want to use the same $P_{M_0|U_0^n}$ of protocol A. Thus, decoder j passes $\hat{U}_{0,j}^n$ through the conditional pmf $P_{M_0|U_0^n}(\hat{m}_{0,j}|\hat{u}_{0,j}^n)$ to get the bin index assigned to $\hat{U}_{0,j}^n$. Similarly, we had constructed the message M_j as a bin index of (U_0^n,U_j^n). To construct the estimate $\hat{m}_j$, we use the conditional pmf $P_{M_j|U_0^n,U_j^n}(\hat{m}_j|\hat{u}_{0,j}^n,\hat{u}_j^n)$ of protocol A.

The random pmf induced by the protocol, denoted by $\hat{P}$, factors as

$$\begin{aligned}&\hat{P}(u_{[0:2]}^n,y_1^n,y_2^n,z^n,m_{[0:2]},f_{[0:2]},\hat{u}_{0,1}^n,\hat{u}_1^n,\hat{u}_{0,2}^n,\hat{u}_2^n)\\&=p^U(f_{[0:2]})p^U(m_{[0:2]})P(u_{[0:2]}^n|m_{[0:2]},f_{[0:2]})p(x^n|u_{[0:2]}^n)p(y_{[1:2]}^n,z^n|x^n)P^{SW}(\hat{u}_{0,1}^n,\hat{u}_1^n|y_1^n,f_0,f_1)P^{SW}(\hat{u}_{0,2}^n,\hat{u}_2^n|y_2^n,f_0,f_2).\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

We have ignored $\hat{M}$-r.v.s from the pmf at this stage since they are (random) functions of other random variables.

Part (2a) of the proof: Sufficient conditions that make the induced pmfs approximately the same: To find the constraints that imply that the pmf $\hat{P}$ is close to the pmf P in total variation distance, we start with P and make it close to $\hat{P}$ in a few steps. The first step is to observe that in protocol A, (m_0,f_0) is a bin index of u_0^n, (m_1,f_1) is a bin index of (u_0^n,u_1^n) and (m_2,f_2) is a bin index of (u_0^n,u_2^n). Substituting $X_1=U_0,X_2=U_0U_j,Z=constant$ in Theorem 1 implies that $M_{[0:2]}$ is nearly independent of $F_{[0:2]}$ if

$$\begin{aligned}R_0+\tilde{R}_0&<H(U_0),\\R_0+R_j+\tilde{R}_0+\tilde{R}_j&<H(U_0U_j)\ ,j=1,2,\\R_0+R_1+R_2+\tilde{R}_0+\tilde{R}_1+\tilde{R}_2&<H(U_{[0:2]}).\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

In other words, the above constraints imply that there exists $\epsilon_n\to 0$ such that $P(f_{[0:2]},m_{[0:2]})\overset{\epsilon_n}{\approx}p^U(f_{[0:2]})p^U(m_{[0:2]})=\hat{P}(f_{[0:2]},m_{[0:2]})$. Equations (29) and (30) imply

$$\hat{P}(u_{[0:2]}^n,y_1^n,y_2^n,z^n,m_{[0:2]},f_{[0:2]},\hat{u}_{0,1}^n,\hat{u}_1^n,\hat{u}_{0,2}^n,\hat{u}_2^n)\overset{\epsilon_n}{\approx}P(u_{[0:2]}^n,y_1^n,y_2^n,z^n,m_{[0:2]},f_{[0:2]},\hat{u}_{0,1}^n,\hat{u}_1^n,\hat{u}_{0,2}^n,\hat{u}_2^n). \tag{32}$$

Part (2b) of the proof: Sufficient conditions that make the Slepian-Wolf decoder succeed: The next step is to see that for the Slepian-Wolf decoder of protocol A to work well. Lemma 1 for $X_1=U_0,X_2=U_0U_j,Z=Y_j$ yields that the decoding of $U_0^nU_j^n$ is reliable if,

$$\begin{aligned}R_0+R_j&>H(U_0U_j|Y_j),\\R_j&>H(U_j|U_0Y_j)\ \text{ for } j=1,2.\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

It yields that for some vanishing sequence δ_n, we have

$$\begin{aligned}P(u_{[0:2]}^n,y_1^n,y_2^n,z^n,m_{[0:2]},f_{[0:2]},\hat{u}_{0,1}^n,\hat{u}_1^n,\hat{u}_{0,2}^n,\hat{u}_2^n)&\overset{\delta_n}{\approx}P(u_{[0:2]}^n,y_1^n,y_2^n,z^n,m_{[0:2]},f_{[0:2]})\\&\times\mathbf{1}\{\hat{u}_{0,1}^n=\hat{u}_{0,2}^n=u_0^n,\hat{u}_1^n=u_1^n,\hat{u}_2^n=u_2^n\}.\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Using equations (32), (34) and the third part of Lemma 2 we have

$$\hat{P}(u_{[0:2]}^n, y_1^n, y_2^n, z^n, m_{[0:2]}, f_{[0:2]}, \hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, \hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n) \overset{\epsilon_n+\delta_n}{\approx} P(u_{[0:2]}^n, y_1^n, y_2^n, z^n, m_{[0:2]}, f_{[0:2]}) \times \mathbf{1}\{\hat{u}_{0,1}^n = \hat{u}_{0,2}^n = u_0^n, \hat{u}_1^n = u_1^n, \hat{u}_2^n = u_2^n\}. \tag{35}$$

Using first part of Lemma 2 we have

$$\hat{P}(u_{[0:2]}^n, z^n, m_{[0:2]}, f_{[0:2]}, \hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, \hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n) \overset{\epsilon_n+\delta_n}{\approx} P(u_{[0:2]}^n, z^n, m_{[0:2]}, f_{[0:2]}) \times \mathbf{1}\{\hat{u}_{0,1}^n = \hat{u}_{0,2}^n = u_0^n, \hat{u}_1^n = u_1^n, \hat{u}_2^n = u_2^n\}. \tag{36}$$

Part (2c) of the proof: Sufficient conditions that make the protocols secure: We must take care of independence of $M_{[0:2]}$, and $(Z^n, F_{[0:2]})$ consisting of the the wiretapper's output and the shared randomness. Consider the random variables of protocol A. Substituting $X_1 = U_0, X_2 = U_0U_j, Z = Z$ in Theorem 1 implies that $M_{[0:2]}$ is nearly independent of $(Z^n, F_{[0:2]})$ if

$$\begin{aligned} R_0 + \tilde{R}_0 &< H(U_0|Z), \\ R_0 + R_j + \tilde{R}_0 + \tilde{R}_j &< H(U_0U_j|Z)\ , j = 1, 2, \\ R_0 + R_1 + R_2 + \tilde{R}_0 + \tilde{R}_1 + \tilde{R}_2 &< H(U_{[0:2]}|Z). \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

In other words, the above constraints imply that there exists $\tilde{\epsilon}_n \to 0$ such that

$$P(z^n, f_{[0:2]}, m_{[0:2]}) \overset{\tilde{\epsilon}_n}{\approx} p(z^n)p^U(f_{[0:2]})p^U(m_{[0:2]}). \tag{38}$$

Also observe that the pmf $P(z^n)$ is equal to i.i.d. pmf $p(z^n)$ in Protocol A.

Using equations (36) and (38) and the third part of Lemma 2 we have

$$\hat{P}(u_{[0:2]}^n, z^n, m_{[0:2]}, f_{[0:2]}, \hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, \hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n) \overset{\epsilon_n+\delta_n+\tilde{\epsilon}_n}{\approx} p(z^n)p^U(f_{[0:2]})p^U(m_{[0:2]})P(u_{[0:2]}^n|z^n, m_{[0:2]}, f_{[0:2]}) \times \mathbf{1}\{\hat{u}_{0,1}^n = \hat{u}_{0,2}^n = u_0^n, \hat{u}_1^n = u_1^n, \hat{u}_2^n = u_2^n\}. \tag{39}$$

Part (3) of the proof: Eliminating the shared randomness: In the protocol we assumed that the transmitter, the receivers and the wiretapper have access to shared randomness $F_{[0:2]}$ which is not present in the model. Nevertheless, we show that the transmitter and the receivers can agree on an instance $f_{[0:2]}$ of $F_{[0:2]}$. Using Definition 1, equation (39) guarantees existence of a fixed binning with the corresponding pmf p such that if we replace P with p in (30) and denote the resulting pmf with $\hat{p}$, then

$$\hat{p}(u_{[0:2]}^n, z^n, m_{[0:2]}, f_{[0:2]}, \hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, \hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n) \overset{\epsilon_n+\delta_n+\tilde{\epsilon}_n}{\approx} p(z^n)p^U(f_{[0:2]})p^U(m_{[0:2]})p(u_{[0:2]}^n|z^n, m_{[0:2]}, f_{[0:2]}) \times \mathbf{1}\{\hat{u}_{0,1}^n = \hat{u}_{0,2}^n = u_0^n, \hat{u}_1^n = u_1^n, \hat{u}_2^n = u_2^n\}.$$

Now, the second part of Lemma 2 shows that there exists an instance $f_{[0:2]}$ such that

$$\hat{p}(u_{[0:2]}^n, z^n, m_{[0:2]}, f_{[0:2]}, \hat{u}_{0,1}^n, \hat{u}_1^n, \hat{u}_{0,2}^n, \hat{u}_2^n|f_{[0:2]}) \overset{2(\epsilon_n+\delta_n+\tilde{\epsilon}_n)}{\approx} p(z^n)p^U(m_{[0:2]})p(u_{[0:2]}^n|z^n, m_{[0:2]}, f_{[0:2]}) \times \mathbf{1}\{\hat{u}_{0,1}^n = \hat{u}_{0,2}^n = u_0^n, \hat{u}_1^n = u_1^n, \hat{u}_2^n = u_2^n\}.$$

- *Reliability:* Using the second item in part 1 of Lemma 2 we conclude that

$$\hat{p}(u_0^n, u_j^n, \hat{u}_{0,j}^n, \hat{u}_j^n | f_{[0:2]}) \overset{2(\epsilon_n+\delta_n+\tilde{\epsilon}_n)}{\approx} \mathbf{1}\{\hat{u}_{0,j}^n = u_0^n, \hat{u}_j^n = u_j^n\},$$

  which is equivalent to $\hat{p}\left((\hat{U}_{0,j}^n \hat{U}_j^n) \neq (U_0^n, U_j^n) | f_{[0:2]}\right) \leq 2(\epsilon_n + \delta_n)$. Reliable recovery of the transmitted (U_0^n, U_j^n) implies reliable recovery of the message (M_0, M_j) in receiver j. This is because M_0 is a bin index of U_0^n and M_j is a bin index of (U_0^n, U_j^n) in protocol A. We have used the same conditional pmf in protocol B. After de-randomizing the pmf in the above paragraph, M_0 will become a deterministic function of U_0^n. A similar statement holds for M_1 and M_2.
- *Security:* Using the second item in part 1 of Lemma 2 we conclude that $\hat{p}(z^n, m_{[0:2]} | f_{[0:2]}) \overset{2(\epsilon_n+\delta_n+\tilde{\epsilon}_n)}{\approx} p^U(m_{[0:2]}) p(z^n)$

Finally, identifying $p(x^n | m_{[0:2]}, f_{[0:2]})$ (which is done via generating $u_{[0:2]}$ first) as the encoder and the Slepian-Wolf decoders results in reliable and secure encoder-decoders.

Applying FME on (31), (33) and (37) gives (28). Note that the equations of (31) are completely redundant. ■

Remark 5 *If one only wants to securely transmit a common message M_0 as in [15] (i.e. $R_1 = R_2 = 0$), the second inequality of the* (24) *can be neglected, because it is sufficient to recover M_0 through only U_0^n; it is not necessary to make sure that we do not make any error in decoding U_1^n and U_2^n. This resembles the idea of indirect decoding of Nair and El Gamal. Applying FME gives the following lower bound on R_0 which subsumes the lower bound given in [15] under weak secrecy criterion:*

$$\begin{aligned}R_0 = \max_{p_{QU_{[0:2]}X}} \min \Big\{ & I(U_0U_1; Y_1|Q) - I(U_0U_1; Z|Q), I(U_0U_2; Y_2|Q) - I(U_0U_2; Z|Q), \\ & \frac{1}{2}\big(I(U_0U_1; Y_1|Q) - I(U_0U_1; Z|Q) + I(U_0U_2; Y_2|Q) - I(U_0U_2; Z|Q) - I(U_1; U_2|Q, U_0, Z)\big)\Big\}\end{aligned}$$

We now compare our lower bound with the one given in [15]. The lower bound given in [15] is the maximum of

$$\min\Big\{I(U_0U_1; Y_1|Q) - I(U_0U_1; Z|Q), I(U_0U_2; Y_2|Q) - I(U_0U_2; Z|Q))\Big\}$$

over all $p(q, u_0)p(u_1, u_2, x|u_0)p(y_1, y_2, z|x)$ where $I(U_1, U_2; Z|U_0) \leq I(U_1; Z|U_0) + I(U_2; Z|U_0) - I(U_1; U_2|U_0)$. We first note that because of the Markov chain $Q - U_0 - U_1U_2XZY_1Y_2$ the above constraint is equivalent with $I(U_1, U_2; Z|Q, U_0) \leq I(U_1; Z|Q, U_0) + I(U_2; Z|Q, U_0) - I(U_1; U_2|Q, U_0)$. Algebraic manipulation shows that this constraint holds only when $I(U_1; U_2|Q, U_0, Z) = 0$. We note that the Markov constraint $Q - U_0 - U_1U_2X$ can be dropped. This is because given any (Q, U_0, U_1, U_2, X) where the Markov chain does not hold we can replace U_0 with (U_0, Q) and find a new set of random variables where the Markov chain holds and the inner bound expression remains unchanged. To sum this up, the lower bound of [15] can be rewritten as the maximum of

$$\min\Big\{I(U_0U_1; Y_1|Q) - I(U_0U_1; Z|Q), I(U_0U_2; Y_2|Q) - I(U_0U_2; Z|Q))\Big\}$$

over all $p(q, u_0, u_1, u_2, x)$ where $I(U_1; U_2|Q, U_0, Z) = 0$. It is clear that when $I(U_1; U_2|Q, U_0, Z) = 0$ our lower bound reduces to this lower bound. In general it may be higher because we are taking the maximum over all *$p(q, u_{[0:2]}, x)$ without any constraint.*

IV. COVERING AND PACKING: REVISITED

Most of the achievability proofs in NIT are based on two primitive lemmas, namely packing lemma and covering lemma [1]. Thus it would be interesting to see how our probabilistic proofs relate to these lemmas. We show that Theorem 1 implies a certain form of multivariate covering (but not exactly the one mentioned in [1]). The discussion on packing lemma is similar and hence omitted.

Multivariate covering: We prove a version of multivariate covering that is similar to Marton coding [1]. Consider r.v.'s $X_{[1:T]}Z$. Roughly speaking, we want to prove that under certain conditions on R_i's, there exists a partition of set of typical sequences of $\mathcal{X}_i^n$ into 2^{nR_i} bins of size $2^{nR_i'}=2^{n(H(X_i)-R_i)}$ for $i=1:T$, such that if we choose any of the partitions of $\mathcal{X}_1^n$, and any of the partitions of $\mathcal{X}_2^n$, etc, we can find sequences x_1^n, x_2^n,..., x_T^n in these partitions such that they are jointly typical with each other and with Z^n with high probability, for almost all choice of partitions. The conditions imposed on the rate of the bins, R_i' are given in inequality (40). This is a generalization of the mutual information terms showing up in Marton coding and match the ones reported in [1].

To show this let $\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^n[X_{[1:T]}Z]$ be the set of strongly typical sequences w.r.t. $p_{X_{[1:T]}Z}$. Theorem 1 says that if

$$\forall \mathcal{S}\subseteq[1:T]:\quad \sum_{t\in\mathcal{S}}R_t'>\sum_{t\in\mathcal{S}}H(X_t)-H(X_{\mathcal{S}}|Z), \tag{40}$$

then $P(b_{[1:T]},z^n)\approx p^U(b_{[1:T]})p(z^n)$. One can show that with high probability the number of the typical sequences assigned to *each bin* $b_i\in[1:2^{nR_i}]$ is about $2^{nR_i'}$, for $i=1:T$, provided that $R_i<H(X_i)$ (for example, through the same lines as in the proof of balanced coloring lemma in [17]). This fact alongside with Theorem 1 implies that there exists a fixed binning with the corresponding pmf $\bar{p}$ such that $\bar{p}(z^n,b_{[1:T]})\approx p^U(b_{[1:T]})p(z^n)$ and the number of the typical sequences assigned to each bin $b_i\in[1:2^{nR_i}]$ is about $2^{nR_i'}$, provided that (40) is satisfied. Let $q(b_{[1:T]},x_{[1:T]}^n,z^n)=p^U(b_{[1:T]})p(z^n)\bar{p}(x_{[1:T]}^n|b,z^n)$. Since $\bar{p}(x_{[1:T]}^n,z^n)=p(x_{[1:T]}^n,z^n)$, we have $\bar{p}(\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^n[X_{[1:T]}Z]^c)<\epsilon_n\to 0$. Markov inequality and $q\approx\bar{p}$ imply that $q_{B_{[1:T]}}(\{b_{[1:T]}:q(\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^n[X_{[1:T]}Z]^c|b_{[1:T]})>\sqrt{\epsilon_n}\})\to 0$. Therefore for almost all the choices of $b_{[1:T]}$, the probability of the typical set conditioned on $b_{[1:T]}$ is large, implying a non-zero intersection of the typical set and the product partition set.

V. SUMMARY OF THE FRAMEWORK

We are ready to state the steps of the probabilistic proof, precisely. The probabilistic proof is done in three steps:

1) Specifying r.v.'s via which the information is transmitted, e.g., X in the channel coding, $U_{0:2}$ in the last two examples.

2) Solving the S-W problem corresponding to decoding the desired information at each receiver through random binning, e.g., decoding of $U_{[0:1]}^n$ in the last two examples at decoder 1.

3) Sharing an appropriate bin between terminals such that decoding is reliable, while ensuring that conditioning on a bin does not affect the problem formulation, e.g. the uniformity of the message in channel coding and independence of the messages and wiretapper's output in the secrecy problems, etc.

REFERENCES

[1] A. El Gamal and Y.-H. Kim, “Network information theory,” Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

[2] D. Slepian and J. K. Wolf, “Noiseless coding of correlated information sources,” *IEEE Trans. IT*, 19(4): 471–480, 1973.

[3] I. Csiszar and J. Korner, “Information theory: coding theorems for discrete memoryless systems,” *Akademiai Kiado*, 1997.

[4] J. M. Renes and R. Renner, “Noisy channel coding via privacy amplification and information reconciliation,” *IEEE Trans. IT*, 57(11):7377-7385.

[5] I. Csiszar and J. Korner. “ Broadcast channels with condential messages”. *IEEE Trans. IT*, 24(3):339–348, 1978.

[6] U. M. Maurer and S. Wolf. “Information-Theoretic Key Agreement: From Weak to Strong Secrecy for Free.” in *Advances in Cryptology-Eurocrypt 2000*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science. B. Preneel, 2000, p. 351.

[7] M. Hayashi. “General nonasymptotic and asymptotic formulas in channel resolvability and identication capacity and their application to the wiretap channel.” *IEEE Trans. IT*, 52(4):15621575, 2006.

[8] M. Bloch and J. N. Laneman, “Secrecy from resolvability,” *submitted* to IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, Also *available online*, *Arxiv:1105.5419*, 2011.

[9] A. J. Pierrot, M. Bloch, “Strongly secure communications over the two way wiretap channel,” *IEEE Trans. on Information Forensics and Security*, 6(3):595-605, Sep. 2011.

[10] M. Bloch, “Channel Intrinsic Randomness,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, 2010, pp.2607-2611.

[11] Y. Steinberg. “Resolvability theory for the multiple-access channel.” *IEEE Trans. IT*, 44(2):472–487, 1998.

[12] T. S. Han, “Information-spectrum methods in information theory,” *Springer*, 2003.

[13] P. Cuff. “Communication in networks for coordinating behavior,” *Ph.D dissertation*, Stanford Univ., CA. Jul. 2009.

[14] P. Minero and Y.-H. Kim, “Correlated sources over broadcast channels,” in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inform. Theory (ISIT)*, 2009, pp.2780-2784.

[15] Y.-K. Chia and A. El Gamal, “3-receiver broadcast channels with common and confidential messages”, *Arxiv:0910.1407*.

[16] T. S. Han and M. M. H. Costa, “Broadcast channels with arbitrarily correlated sources,” IEEE Trans. IT, 33(5), 641– 650, 1987.

[17] R. Ahlswede and I. Csiszar, “Common randomness in Information Theory and Cryptography, Part II: CR capacity,” IEEE Trans. IT, 44(1), 225–240, 1998.

[18] M. H. Yassaee, A. Gohari and M. R. Aref, “Channel Simulation via interactive Communications,” to be available on Arxiv.

[19] F. Haddadpour, M. H. Yassaee, A. Gohari and M. R. Aref, “Coordination via a relay,” to be available on Arxiv.

APPENDIX A

PROOF OF THEOREM 1

We prove a slightly generalized version of Theorem 1 in this section. To do this, we need some more definitions most of which are taken from [12].

Definition 2 ([12], Sec. 1.3) *A general source* $\mathbf{X}$ *is a sequence of sequences of random variables, defined as follows:*

$$\mathbf{X} = \left\{ X^n = (X_1^{(n)}, X_2^{(n)}, \cdots, X_n^{(n)}) \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$$

where X^n *is a random variable over the* n*-th Cartesian product* $\mathcal{X}^n$ *of an arbitrary alphabet* $\mathcal{X}$ *with respect to an arbitrary probability distribution* p_{X^n}*. The distribution* p_{X^n} *is not necessarily i.i.d. nor does it even need to satisfy the consistency condition as defined in [12]. We restrict ourselves to general sources with countable* $\mathcal{X}$*. A set of correlated general sources* $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}, \cdots)$ *is defined similarly.*

Definition 3 *The spectral sub-entropy rate of* $\mathbf{X}$ *is defined as*

$$\underline{H}(\mathbf{X})=p-\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\frac{1}{p_{X^n}(X^n)}.$$

Similarly for any two correlated general sources $\mathbf{X}$ *and* $\mathbf{Y}$*, the conditional spectral sub-entropy rate of* $\mathbf{X}$ *given* $\mathbf{Y}$ *is defined as*

$$\underline{H}(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Y})=p-\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\frac{1}{p_{X^n|Y^n}(X^n|Y^n)}.$$

Remark 6 *For the case of discrete memoryless correlated sources the conditional spectral sub-entropy rate reduces to the usual conditional entropy by the WLLN.*

Definition 4 *A distributed random binning of correlated general sources* $\mathbf{X}_{[1:T]},\mathbf{Z}$ *consists of a sequence of a set of random mappings* $\mathcal{B}_i^{(n)}:\mathcal{X}_i^n\to[1:2^{nR_i}]$*,* $i\in[1:T]$*, in which* $\mathcal{B}_i^{(n)}$ *maps each sequence of* $\mathcal{X}_i^n$ *uniformly and independently to the set* $[1:2^{nR_i}]$*. We denote the random variable* $\mathcal{B}_t^{(n)}(X_t^n)$ *by* $B_t^{(n)}$*. A random distributed binning induces the following* random pmf *on the set* $\mathcal{X}_{[1:T]}^n\times\mathcal{Z}^n\times\prod_{t=1}^T[1:2^{nR_t}]$,

$$P(x_{[1:T]}^n,z^n,b_{[1:T]})=p_{X_{[1:T]}^n,Z^n}(x_{[1:T]}^n,z^n)\prod_{t=1}^T\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}_t^{(n)}(x_t^n)=b_t\}.$$

One can easily verify that $(B_1,\cdots,B_T)$ are uniformly distributed and mutually independent of Z^n in the mean, that is

$$\mathbb{E}P(z^n,b_{[1:T]})=2^{-n\sum_{t=1}^T R_t}p_{Z^n}(z^n)=p_{Z^n}(z^n)\prod_{t=1}^T p^U_{[1:2^{nR_t}]}(b_t).$$

Theorem 4 *If for each* $\mathcal{S}\subseteq[1:T]$*, the following constraint holds*

$$\sum_{t\in\mathcal{S}}R_t<\underline{H}(X_{\mathcal{S}}|Z),\tag{41}$$

then as n *goes to infinity, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left\|P(z^n,b_{[1:T]})-p_{Z^n}(z^n)\prod_{t=1}^T p^U_{[1:2^{nR_t}]}(b_t)\right\|_1\to 0.\tag{42}$$

Proof: We define the following typical set,

$$\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^n:=\left\{(x_{[1:T]}^n,z^n):(x_{\mathcal{S}}^n,z^n)\in\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^n(\mathcal{S}),\forall\mathcal{S}\subseteq[1:T]\right\}.$$

where $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^n(\mathcal{S})$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^n(\mathcal{S}):=\left\{(x_{\mathcal{S}}^n,z^n):-\frac{1}{n}\log p_{X_{\mathcal{S}}^n|Z^n}(x_{\mathcal{S}}^n|z^n)\geq\underline{H}(X_{\mathcal{S}}|Z)-\epsilon,\right\}.\tag{43}$$

Since for each $\mathcal{S}\subseteq[1:T]$, $\lim_{n\to\infty}p(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^n(\mathcal{S}))=1$, we have $\lim_{n\to\infty}p(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^n)=1$. Next note that

$$\hat{P}(z^n,b_{[1:T]})=\sum_{x_{[1:T]}^n}p(x_{[1:T]}^n,z^n)\prod_{t=1}^T\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}_t^{(n)}(x_t^n)=b_t\}.$$

We can decompose this sum into two parts (similar to [13]) as follows:

$$\hat{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) = \sum_{\substack{x^n_{[1:T]}: \\ (x^n_{[1:T]}, z^n) \in \mathcal{A}^n_\epsilon}} p(x^n_{[1:T]}, z^n) \prod_{t=1}^{T} \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_t(x^n_t) = b_t\},$$

$$\tilde{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) = \sum_{\substack{x^n_{[1:T]}: \\ (x^n_{[1:T]}, z^n) \notin \mathcal{A}^n_\epsilon}} p(x^n_{[1:T]}, z^n) \prod_{t=1}^{T} \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_t(x^n_t) = b_t\}.$$

We then have

$$P(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) = \hat{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) + \tilde{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]}).$$

Thus

$$\mathbb{E}P(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) = \mathbb{E}\hat{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) + \mathbb{E}\tilde{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]}).$$

Using triangle inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left\| P(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) - p_{Z^n}(z^n) \prod_{t=1}^{T} p^U_{[1:2^{nR_t}]}(b_t) \right\|_1 &= \mathbb{E}\left\| P(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) - \mathbb{E}P(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left\| \hat{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) - \mathbb{E}\hat{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) \right\|_1 \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\left\| \tilde{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) - \mathbb{E}\tilde{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) \right\|_1. \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Therefore we need to show that both of the terms on the right hand side converge to zero as n converges to infinity. For the second term we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left\| \tilde{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) - \mathbb{E}\tilde{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) \right\|_1 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{z^n, b_{[1:T]}} 2\mathbb{E}\tilde{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \sum_{z^n, x^n_{[1:T]}, b_{[1:T]} : (z^n, x^n_{[1:T]}) \notin \mathcal{A}^n_\epsilon} P(z^n, x^n_{[1:T]}, b_{[1:T]}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \sum_{z^n, x^n_{[1:T]} : (z^n, x^n_{[1:T]}) \notin \mathcal{A}^n_\epsilon} P(z^n, x^n_{[1:T]}) \\ &= p_{X^n_{[1:T]} Z^n}\left((\mathcal{A}^n_\epsilon)^c\right) \to 0, \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

where in the first step we use the inequality $\mathbb{E}|X - \mathbb{E}X| \leq 2\mathbb{E}|X|$ and in the last step, we use the relation $P(z^n, x^n_{[1:T]}) = p_{X^n_{[1:T]} Z^n}(z^n, x^n_{[1:T]})$. Next consider the first term of the r.h.s. of equation (44). Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have

$$\sum_{z^n, b_{[1:T]}} \mathbb{E}|\hat{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]}) - \mathbb{E}\hat{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]})| \leq \sum_{z^n, b_{[1:T]}} \sqrt{\mathsf{var}(\hat{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]}))}. \tag{46}$$

Applying the formula $\mathsf{var}(\sum_{i=1}^{T} X_i) = \sum_{1\le i,j\le T} \mathsf{cov}(X_i, X_j)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{var}(\hat{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]})) &= \sum_{\substack{x^n_{[1:T]},\bar{x}^n_{[1:T]}: \\ (x^n_{[1:T]},z^n)\in\mathcal{A}^n_\epsilon,\ (\bar{x}^n_{[1:T]},z^n)\in\mathcal{A}^n_\epsilon}} \mathsf{cov}\Big(p(x^n_{[1:T]}, z^n)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_{[1:T]}(x^n_{[1:T]}) = b_{[1:T]}\} \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad , p(\bar{x}^n_{[1:T]}, z^n)\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_{[1:T]}(\bar{x}^n_{[1:T]}) = b_{[1:T]}\}\Big) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{x^n_{[1:T]},\bar{x}^n_{[1:T]}: \\ (x^n_{[1:T]},z^n)\in\mathcal{A}^n_\epsilon,\ (\bar{x}^n_{[1:T]},z^n)\in\mathcal{A}^n_\epsilon}} p(x^n_{[1:T]}, z^n)p(\bar{x}^n_{[1:T]}, z^n) \\ &\qquad\qquad \times \mathsf{cov}\Big(\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_{[1:T]}(x^n_{[1:T]}) = b_{[1:T]}\}, \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_{[1:T]}(\bar{x}^n_{[1:T]}) = b_{[1:T]}\}\Big) \qquad (47)\end{aligned}$$

To evaluate the *covariance* term, we first partition the set $\{(x^n_{[1:T]}, \bar{x}^n_{[1:T]}) : (x^n_{[1:T]}, z^n) \in \mathcal{A}^n_\epsilon,\ (\bar{x}^n_{[1:T]}, z^n) \in \mathcal{A}^n_\epsilon\}$ into the sets $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S}, z^n)$ defined below:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S}, z^n) := \Big\{(x^n_{[1:T]}, \bar{x}^n_{[1:T]}) :& x^n_{\mathcal{S}} = \bar{x}^n_{\mathcal{S}},\ x^n_t \ne \bar{x}^n_t,\ \forall t \in \mathcal{S}^c, \\ & (x^n_{[1:T]}, z^n) \in \mathcal{A}^n_\epsilon,\ (\bar{x}^n_{[1:T]}, z^n) \in \mathcal{A}^n_\epsilon\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

We note that for each pair $(x^n_{[1:T]}, \bar{x}^n_{[1:T]})$ inside the set $\mathcal{N}(\emptyset, z^n)$, the random variables $\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_{[1:T]}(x^n_{[1:T]}) = b_{[1:T]}\}$ and $\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_{[1:T]}(\bar{x}^n_{[1:T]}) = b_{[1:T]}\}$ are independent, thus the covariance between them is zero. Next for $\mathcal{S} \ne \emptyset$, we bound above the covariance for the pair $(x^n_{[1:T]}, \bar{x}^n_{[1:T]}) \in \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S}, z^n)$ as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{cov}\Big(\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_{[1:T]}(x^n_{[1:T]}) = b_{[1:T]}\}, \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_{[1:T]}(\bar{x}^n_{[1:T]}) = b_{[1:T]}\}\Big) &\le \mathbb{E}\ \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_{[1:T]}(x^n_{[1:T]}) = \mathcal{B}^{(n)}_{[1:T]}(\bar{x}^n_{[1:T]}) = b_{[1:t]}\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}\ \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_{\mathcal{S}}(x^n_{\mathcal{S}}) = b_{\mathcal{S}}, \mathcal{B}^{(n)}_{\mathcal{S}^c}(x^n_{\mathcal{S}^c}) = \mathcal{B}^{(n)}_{\mathcal{S}^c}(\bar{x}^n_{[1:T]}) = b_{\mathcal{S}^c}\} \\ &= 2^{-n(R_{\mathcal{S}}+2R_{\mathcal{S}^c})}, \qquad (48)\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step, we use the fact that the random variables $\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_{\mathcal{S}}(x^n_{\mathcal{S}}) = b_{\mathcal{S}}\}$, $\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_{\mathcal{S}^c}(x^n_{\mathcal{S}^c}) = b_{\mathcal{S}^c}\}$ and $\mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{B}^{(n)}_{\mathcal{S}^c}(\bar{x}^n_{\mathcal{S}^c}) = b_{\mathcal{S}^c}\}$ are mutually independent.

Substituting (48) in (47) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{var}(\hat{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]})) &\le \sum_{\emptyset\ne\mathcal{S}\subseteq[1:T]} \sum_{(x^n_{[1:T]},\bar{x}^n_{[1:T]})\in\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{S},z^n)} p(x^n_{[1:T]}, z^n)p(\bar{x}^n_{[1:T]}, z^n)2^{-n(R_{\mathcal{S}}+2R_{\mathcal{S}^c})} \\ &\le p^2(z^n) \sum_{\emptyset\ne\mathcal{S}\subseteq[1:T]} 2^{-n(R_{\mathcal{S}}+2R_{\mathcal{S}^c})} \sum_{x^n_{\mathcal{S}}:(x^n_{\mathcal{S}},z^n)\in\mathcal{A}^n_\epsilon(\mathcal{S})} p^2(x^n_{\mathcal{S}}|z^n) \\ &\qquad \times \sum_{x^n_{\mathcal{S}^c},\bar{x}^n_{\mathcal{S}^c}} p(x^n_{\mathcal{S}^c}|x^n_{\mathcal{S}}, z^n)p(\bar{x}^n_{\mathcal{S}^c}|x^n_{\mathcal{S}}, z^n) \\ &= p^2(z^n) \sum_{\emptyset\ne\mathcal{S}\subseteq[1:T]} 2^{-n(R_{\mathcal{S}}+2R_{\mathcal{S}^c})} \sum_{x^n_{\mathcal{S}}:(x^n_{\mathcal{S}},z^n)\in\mathcal{A}^n_\epsilon(\mathcal{S})} p^2(x^n_{\mathcal{S}}|z^n) \\ &\le p^2(z^n) \sum_{\emptyset\ne\mathcal{S}\subseteq[1:T]} 2^{-n(R_{\mathcal{S}}+2R_{\mathcal{S}^c}+\underline{H}(X_{\mathcal{S}}|Y)-\epsilon)} \qquad (49)\end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from the definition of the set $\mathcal{A}^n_\epsilon(\mathcal{S})$.

Substituting (49) in (46) and using the inequality $\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sqrt{a_i}$ yield

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{z^n, b_{[1:T]}} \sqrt{\mathsf{var}(\hat{P}(z^n, b_{[1:T]}))} &\leq \sum_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq [1:T]} \sum_{z^n} p(z^n) 2^{-\frac{n}{2}(\underline{H}(X_{\mathcal{S}}|Y) - R_{\mathcal{S}} - \epsilon)} \\ &\leq \sum_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq [1:T]} 2^{-\frac{n}{2}(\underline{H}(X_{\mathcal{S}}|Y) - R_{\mathcal{S}} - \epsilon)} \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

Finally if for each $\mathcal{S} \subseteq [1:T]$ we have $R_{\mathcal{S}} \leq \underline{H}(X_{\mathcal{S}}|Z)$ then (50) vanishes as n goes to infinity. This concludes the proof. ■

Remark 7 *If the correlated sources are i.i.d and have finite alphabets, one can use the set of strong typical sequence instead of the set $\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^{n}$ in the proof. Since the probability of the set of* *non- strong typical sequences* *vanishes exponentially in n, one can observe that the total variation distance in Theorem 1 also vanishes exponentially in n .*